



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,438	12/05/2001	Neil Y. Iwamoto	36.P325	6310

5514 7590 06/27/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/017,438

Applicant(s)

IWAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-16 are pending..
2. Claims 1,11,12,14,15 have been amended. The Final action is appropriate.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-18 of copending Application No. 10/309884. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

(Application, claim 1) A method for controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by both the user based on centralized access management information the method comprising:

receiving access management information for the user at the networked peripheral device from a centralized location;

determining, at the networked peripheral device, a function of the networked peripheral device and a quota corresponding to the function that are available to the user based on the received access management information;

allowing the user to access the to the networked peripheral device based on the determined function and the determined quota corresponding to the function.

(‘884, claim 1) A method for controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user and based on centralized access management information accessible by a server, the method comprising:

authenticating the user based on authentication information corresponding to the user location;

determining, at the server, a first level of access to the networked peripheral device available to the user based on the access management information;

transmitting access management information for the user to the networked peripheral device in a case that the first level of access determined by the server conforms to a level of access to a function necessary to perform a job requested by the user;

determining, at the networked peripheral device, a second level of access to the networked peripheral device available to the user based on the transmitted access management information; and

allowing the user to access to the networked peripheral device based on the second determined level of access.

It was obvious to an ordinary skill in the art to incorporate “the quota corresponding to the function” which was a well-known feature in the art (see Camillone reference) as a level of access.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shambroom [5,923,756] in view of Camillone et al [Camillone, 5,421,011].

3. As per claim 1, Shambroom discloses A method for controlling access to a networked peripheral device (i.e.: a destination server) by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by both the user based on centralized access management information the method comprising:

receiving access management information for the user at the networked peripheral device from a centralized location [Shambroom, a network server, Fig 1, col 6 lines 21-41; passes login information to the client, col 10 lines 42-54];

determining, at the networked peripheral device, a function of the networked peripheral device (and a quota corresponding to the function) that are available to the

user based on the received access management information [Shambroom, client access to destination server, col 9 lines 45-55];

allowing the user to access the to the networked peripheral device [Shambroom, the client access the destination server using said permission data, col 15 lines 1-67]

However Shambroom does not detail the function or management information included "a quota corresponding to the function" or "based on the determined function and the determined quota corresponding to the function".

It was well-known in the art that a computer system (i.e.: UNIX system) provides the resource access and control system wherein the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas [Camillone, col 8 lines 50-65]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate "a quota corresponding to the function" or "based on the determined function and the determined quota corresponding to the function" as taught by Camillone into the Shambroom's apparatus in order to utilize the management information. Doing so would provide an improved resource control allocation mechanism in a data processing system [Camillon, col 4 lines 29-31].

4. As per claim 2, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the networked peripheral device is a multifunction peripheral device as inherent features of network devices.

5. As per claim 3, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the access management information is supplied by an authentication server once the authentication server authenticates the user based on authentication information received from the networked peripheral device [Shambroom, authentication and/or encryption protocol, col 6 line 55-7 line 12].

6. As per claim 4, Shambroom-Camillone disclose a user interface is devised by the networked peripheral device that is specific to the determined function and corresponding quota [Camillone, the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas, col 8 lines 50-65].

7. As per claim 5, Shambroom-Camillone disclose on a keypad on the device are enabled and/or disabled according to the determined function and corresponding quota [Camillone, the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas, col 8 lines 50-65].

8. As per claim 6, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the user is walk-up user, and wherein the access management information is supplied by an authentication server that authenticates both the walk-up user and the remote user [Shambroom, authentication and/or encryption protocol, col 6 line 55-7 line 12].

9. As per claim 7, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the authentication information is a username and/or password [Shambroom, login and password, col 7 lines 59-64].

10. As per claim 8, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the authentication information is entered by inserting a smart card at the networked peripheral device as a design choice.

11. As per claim 9, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the access management information is encrypted [Shambroom, authentication and/or encryption protocol, col 6 line 55-7 line 12].

12. As per claim 10, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the authentication information received from the networked peripheral device is encrypted [Shambroom, authentication and/or encryption protocol, col 6 line 55-7 line 12].

13. Claims 11,12 contain the similar limitations as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, claims 11,12 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

14. As per claim 13, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information,

said apparatus comprising means for performing the functions specified in any of claims 1 to 10 [see rejection claims 1-10].

15. As per claim 14, Shambroom-Camillone disclose network peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information, said computer-executable process steps comprising process steps executable to perform a method according to any of claims 1 to 10 [see rejection claims 1-10].

16. As per claim 16, Shambroom-Camillone disclose the server retrieves authentication information for the user from a directory service [Shambroom, database, col 10 lines 16-25].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Northington et al [Northington 6,128,602] in view of Camillone et al [Camillone, 5,421,011].

18. As per claim 1, Northington discloses A method for controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is

accessible by both the user based on centralized access management information the method comprising:

receiving access management information for the user at the networked peripheral device from a centralized location [Northington, Internet server, web server, enable transmission of data request, mangement and control commands accordance with the user's level of security access level, col 3 lines 62-col 4 line 6];

determining, at the networked peripheral device, a function of the networked peripheral device (and a quota corresponding to the function) that are available to the user based on the received access management information [Northington, Internet server, web server, enable transmission of data request, mangement and control commands, col 3 lines 62-col 4 line 6];

allowing the user to access the to the networked peripheral device [Northington, provide authorized users the ability to access, col 9 line 49-col 10 line 14]

However Northington does not detail the function or management information included "a quota corresponding to the function" or "based on the determined function and the determined quota corresponding to the function".

It was well-known in the art that a computer system (i.e.: UNIX system) provides the resource access and control system wherein the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas [Camillone, col 8 lines 50-65]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate "a quota corresponding to the function" or "based on

the determined function and the determined quota corresponding to the function" as taught by Camillone into the Northington's apparatus in order to utilize the management information. Doing so would provide an improved resource control allocation mechanism in a data processing system [Camillon, col 4 lines 29-31].

19. As per claim 2, Northington-Camillone disclose the networked peripheral device is a multifunction peripheral device [Northington, multiple levels, col 3 lines 21-33].

20. As per claim 3, Northington-Camillone disclose the access management information is supplied by an authentication server once the authentication server authenticates the user based on authentication information received from the networked peripheral device [Northington, provide authorized users the ability to access, col 9 line 49-col 10 line 14].

21. As per claim 4, Northington-Camillone disclose a user interface is devised by the networked peripheral device that is specific to the determined function and corresponding quota [Camillone, the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas, col 8 lines 50-65].

22. As per claim 5, Northington-Camillone disclose on a keypad on the device are enabled and/or disabled according to the determined function and corresponding quota

Art Unit: 2142

[Camillone, the access control is performed (i.e.: function) by the quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas, col 8 lines 50-65].

23. As per claim 6, Northington-Camillone disclose the user is walk-up user, and wherein the access management information is supplied by an authentication server that authenticates both the walk-up user and the remote user [Northington, smart card reader, col 11 lines 53-64].

24. As per claim 7, Northington-Camillone disclose the authentication information is a username and/or password [Northington, login and password, col 6 line 52-col 7 line 4].

25. As per claim 8, Northington -Camillone disclose the authentication information is entered by inserting a smart card at the networked peripheral device [Northington, smart card, col 11 lines 53-64].

26. As per claim 9, Northington -Camillone disclose the access management information is encrypted [Northington, encryption, col 6 line 52-col 7 line 4].

27. As per claim 10, Northington -Camillone disclose the authentication information received from the networked peripheral device is encrypted [Northington, encryption, col 6 line 52-col 7 line 4].

28. Claims 11,12 contain the similar limitations as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, claims 11,12 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

29. As per claim 13, Northington-Camillone disclose the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information, said apparatus comprising means for performing the functions specified in any of claims 1 to 10 [see rejection claims 1-10].

30. As per claim 14, Northington-Camillone disclose network peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information, said computer-executable process steps comprising process steps executable to perform a method according to any of claims 1 to 10 [see rejection claims 1-10].

31. As per claim 16, Northington-Camillone disclose the server retrieves authentication information for the user from a directory service [Northington, database, col 7 lines 28-44].

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2142

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath.